

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,421	03/01/2004	John Gaughan	044499-0197	4963
22428 7:	590 03/27/2006		EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			LEJA, RONALD W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	
		DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/788,421	GAUGHAN, JOHN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ronald W. Leja	2836			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE	<u>Eof 3/1/2006</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ∑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,2,5-8,14 and 15 is/are pending in the day of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,2,5-8,14 and 15 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	a) accepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati prity documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)				
Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ratent Application (PTO-152)			

Claims 14 and 15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The specific limitations added by Claims 14 and 15 already appear in Independent Claim 8, from which they depend.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Independent Claims 1, 2 and 8 each include "the resistor having a constant resistance value that does not change with current supplied thereto or temperature of an environment in which the resistor is disposed" and Claims 2 and 8 further include "wherein the first and second transistors are maintained in an ON state irrespective as to an amount of current provided thereto".

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/788,421

Art Unit: 2836

Claims 2, 5-8, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent Claim 2 and 8 each require that the first and second transistors are maintained in an ON state irrespective as to an amount of current provided thereto. This is not understood by the Examiner and in Applicant's Specification, on Page 3, paragraph [0014], it essentially states that "a very small base current is required through TR2 in order to operate", and as such, the transistors cannot be considered to be maintained in the ON state irrespective as to an amount of current provided thereto. Clarification is requested.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, Jr. (3,684,924) in view of "Another Darlington Pair Speed Control" by Howard Lloyd, 6/8/2002 (here-in-after referred to as Lloyd).

Miller, Jr. discloses a circuit in Figure 1 comprising a surge suppressing circuit having a diode (42) connected to the input of the surge suppressing circuit, first (66) and second (64) transistors arranged as a Darlington pair in series with the diode (42) and a resistor (76) connected to the base of the second transistor (64), but does not appear to disclose that the Darlington Pair is complementary and that the resistor has a constant resistance value which does not change with supplied current or

Application/Control Number: 10/788,421

Art Unit: 2836

temperature of the environment. However, Lloyd teaches a Darlington Pair having a complementary configuration. It would have been obvious to replace the Darlington pair of Miller, Jr. with the Darlington pair of Lloyd so as to take advantage of the reduced voltage drop across the "complementary Darlington Pair", thereby increasing efficiency. The same amount of current amplification can be achieved with one less Vbe drop. As far as the details of the resistor value with respect to current and temperature, it is the opinion of the Examiner that to the extent that Applicant's resistor does not change due to current and temperature, the value of the resistance of the resistor of Miller, Jr. also does not change with respect to current and temperature.

Claims 2, 5-8, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (4,576,135) in view of "Another Darlington Pair Speed Control" by Howard Lloyd, 6/8/2002 (here-in-after referred to as Lloyd).

Johnson discloses in Figure 2, a surge suppressing circuit having a diode (68) connected in series with the surge suppressing circuit, first and second transistors arranged as a Darlington Pair (66), a resistor (76) connected to the base of the second transistor and a zener diode (78) connected between the base of the second transistor and ground, but does not appear to disclose a Complementary Darlington Pair or that the diode (68) is connected to the input of the surge suppressing circuit. However, Lloyd teaches a Darlington Pair having a complementary configuration wherein the first transistor is a PNP and the second transistor is an NPN for Claim 8. It would have been obvious to replace the Darlington pair of Johnson with the Darlington pair of Lloyd so as to take advantage of the reduced voltage drop across the "complementary Darlington Pair", thereby increasing efficiency. The same amount of

Application/Control Number: 10/788,421

Art Unit: 2836

current amplification can be achieved with one less Vbe drop. The diode (68) helps prevent a reverse current flow within the surge suppressing circuit and allows for current flow from the 60v line when voltage drops from the 12v line, thereby ensuring a regulated voltage on the VREG line. It would have been obvious to include a diode at the input of the surge suppressing circuit, so as to ensure no back current could flow into the 60v line, thereby increasing the reliability of the system. As far as the details of the resistor value with respect to current and temperature, it is the opinion of the Examiner, that to the extent that Applicant's resistor does not change due to current and temperature, the value of the resistance of the resistor of Johnson also does not change with respect to current and temperature. As far as the use of a capacitor for Claim 7, its use would have been obvious as a means to adjust response times to an overvoltage condition for the zener diode, thereby preventing any shunting for momentary overages, leading to smoother design operation.

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald W. Leja whose telephone number is (571)272-2053. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on (571)272-2800. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/788,421 Page 6

Art Unit: 2836

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald W Leja Primary Examiner Art Unit 2836

rwl March 15, 2006